



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

No. 020] CHANDIGARH, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 05, 2025 (MAGHA 16, 1946 SAKA)

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
TECHNICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 4th February, 2025

No. P-437952/IH(3)/2025/1904.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution of India, read with Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Notification S.O. No. 3267, dated 1st November, 1966 and in supersession of the Industrial Training Institute, Chandigarh (Group C) Recruitment Rules, 1999 in respect of the post of Pharmacist only, the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh makes the following rules, regulating the method of recruitment to the Group 'C' post i.e. **Pharmacist** in the Govt. Industrial Training Institute, Sector-28, Chandigarh namely:-

1. **Short title and commencement:-** (i) These rules may be called the Govt. Industrial Training Institute, Chandigarh (Group 'C') (Non- Gazetted, Non- Ministerial) Recruitment Rules, 2025.

(ii) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. **Application:**

These rules shall apply to the posts specified in column No.1 of the Schedule annexed to these rules.

3. **Number of posts, classification and scale of pay:-**

The number of posts, their classification and the scales of pay shall be as specified in columns 2 to 4 of the said Schedule.

4. **Method of recruitment, age limit and qualification, etc:-**

The method of recruitment to the said posts, age limit, qualifications and other matters connected therewith shall be as specified in columns 5 to 13 of the said Schedule.

5. **Disqualification: No person:**

- (a) who has entered into or contracted a marriage with a person having a spouse living; or
- (b) who, having a spouse living, has entered into or contracted a marriage, with any person, shall be eligible for the appointment to the said posts:

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by
Jalinder Kumar
Date: 2025.02.05
12:29:15 (IST)
Reason: Published
Location:

Provided that the Administrator, Union Territory of Chandigarh may, if satisfied that such marriage is permissible under the personal Law applicable to such person and other party to the marriage and there are other grounds for so doing, exempt, any person from the operation of this rule.

6. Power to relax:-

Where the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient so to do, he may, by order, for reasons to be recorded in writing, relax any of the provisions of these rules in respect of any class or category of persons.

7. Savings:-

Nothing in these rules shall affect reservations, relaxation of age limit and other concessions required to be provided for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, Ex-Servicemen and other special categories of persons in accordance with the orders issued by Central Government from time to time in this regard.

(Sd.) . . . ,

Secretary Technical Education,
Chandigarh Administration.

Schedule**Annexure-I****Organization:- Government Industrial Training Institute, Chandigarh**

1	Name of the Post	Pharmacist
2	No. of Post	01*(2025) * Subject to variation dependent on work load
3	Classification	General Central Services (Group-C) Non-Gazetted/Non-Ministerial
4	Pay Band and Grade Pay/Pay Scale	Pay Level-5 (Rs.29200-92300) in the pay matrix of 7 th CPC.
5	Whether selection post or non selection post	Not applicable
6	Age limit for direct recruits	Between 18 -25 years. (Relaxable for departmental candidates up to 40 years in accordance with instructions or orders issued by Central Government from time to time) Note: The crucial date for determining the age limit shall be the closing date for receipt of applications from candidates in India and not closing date prescribed for those in Assam, Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland, Tripura, Sikkim, Ladakh, Lahaul & Spiti District and Pangi Sub-division of Himachal Pradesh, Andaman & Nicobar Islands or Lakshadweep.
7	Educational and other qualifications required for Direct recruits	i) Bachelor Degree in Pharmacy (Allopathic) from a Central / State Government recognised University /Institution OR Diploma in Pharmacy (Allopathic) from a Central / State Government recognised University /Institution ; AND ii) Registered as Pharmacist under the Pharmacy Act, 1948. Note:1-The selected candidate has to get himself registered in Chandigarh Pharmacy Council within 06 months of joining. 2. The direct recruits have to submit the certificate of training in Information Communications Technology (ICT) Skills of 80 hours at the time of their appointment, as per instructions issued by Chandigarh Administration vide No.28/69-IH(12)/Pers. & Trg-2019/17927 dated 25 th November 2019.
8	Whether age and educational qualifications prescribed for direct recruits will apply in the case of promotees	Not applicable
9	Period of probation, if any	Two years (Successful completion of mandatory Induction Training of at least two weeks duration shall be the pre-requisite for completion of probation in case of Direct Recruitment)

10	Method of Recruitment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by deputation/ absorption and percentage of the vacancies to be filled by various methods	<p>100% by Direct Recruitment</p> <p>Note: Vacancies caused by the incumbent being away on transfer on deputation or long illness or study leave or under other circumstances for duration of one year or more may be filled on deputation basis from officers/Officials of Central Government / State Government / UT Administration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Holding analogous post on regular basis in the parent cadre/ department; and Possessing the educational qualifications prescribed for direct recruits under column 7. <p>Note:- 1 The period of deputation including the period of deputation in another ex-cadre post held immediately preceding this appointment in the same or some other organization/ department of the Central Government/ State Government/ UT Administration shall be as per the instructions / guidelines issued by the Government from time to time.</p> <p>2. The maximum age limit for appointment by deputation shall be not exceeding fifty six years as on the closing date of receipt of application.</p>
11	In case of recruitment by promotion/ deputation/ absorption, grades from which promotion/ deputation/ absorption to be made	NA
12	If a Departmental Promotion Committee exists, what is its composition	<p>Departmental Confirmation Committee (DCC) for confirmation:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Director Technical Education UT Chandigarh- Chairman Representative of Personnel department – Member Representative of Social Welfare - Member Representative of Regional Employment Officer – Member
13	Circumstances in which Union Public Service Commission to be consulted in making Recruitment	Not Applicable.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF FORESTS & WILDLIFE

Notification

The 28th January, 2025

No. FOR/25/7617-7640.—In supersession of the Chandigarh Administration, Forest Department Notification bearing No. 222 dated 23rd September, 2019 and in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub Section (1) of Section 6 of the Wildlife (Protection) Amendment Act, 2002 and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh is pleased to reconstitute State Board for Wildlife for the Union Territory of Chandigarh with the following members :-

1.	Administrator of UT, Chandigarh	Chairperson
2.	Chief Secretary of UT, Chandigarh	Vice-Chairperson
3.	Mayor, Municipal Corporation	Member
4.	Councillor, to be recommended by Municipal Corporation, UT, Chandigarh	Member
5.	Secretary/Principal Secretary (Environment and Forests), UT, Chandigarh	Member
6.	Director General of Police, UT, Chandigarh	Member
7.	Chief Conservator of Forests (HoD)	Member
8.	Managing Director, Chandigarh Indl. Tourism Dev. Corporation Ltd. (CITCO), UT, Chandigarh	Member
9.	A representative of the Armed Forces not below the rank of Brigadier to be recommended by GOC-in-C Western Command	Member
10.	Director, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, UT, Chandigarh	Member
11.	A nominee/representative of the Director, Wildlife Preservation, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Govt. of India	Member
12.	A representative of Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun	Member
13.	A representative of the Botanical Survey of India	Member
14.	A representative of the Zoological Survey of India	Member
15.	Deputy Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) UT, Chandigarh.	Member
16.	World Wide Fund for Nature India (WWF) through its Secretary General & CEO or his Authorized representative.	Member
17.	Prof. R.K. Kohli, (PhD, FNA, FASc, FNASc, FNAAS, FRSC, FRSB), Vice Chancellor, Amity University, Punjab, Mohali.	Member

18.	Shri Manmohan Singh Negi, IFS Principal Secretary (E&F) & PCCF (HoFF) & Arunachal Pradesh (Retd.)	Member
19.	Dr S.S. Garewal, M.Sc., PhD, Former Director, PAU, Zonal Research Station.	Member
20.	Chief Wildlife Warden, UT, Chandigarh	Member Secretary

2. The functions and duties of the Board will be same as described under Section 8 of the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 and as amended from time to time.
3. The term of the office other than those who are the members *ex-officio* will be 03 years.
4. The members (except members *ex-officio*) shall be entitled to receive such allowance in respect of expenses incurred in the performance of the duties as per the latest instructions of the Government.

Dated Chandigarh,
The 08th Jan, 2025.

MANDIP SINGH BRAR, IAS,
Secretary Forests,
Chandigarh Administration

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF FORESTS & WILDLIFE

Notification

The 17th January, 2025

No. CCFD/2025/745.—In partial modification to the notification issued vide no. FOR/2020/411 dated 23.01.2020, the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh is pleased to reconstitute the Executive Committee of the State Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA), for Union Territory, Chandigarh, consisting of the following, for various activities related to CAMPA:-

STATE LEVEL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:-

1.	Chief Conservator of Forest, U.T., Chandigarh	Chairperson
2.	Chief Wildlife Warden, U.T., Chandigarh	Ex-officio Member
3.	Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, U.T., Chandigarh	Ex-officio Member
4.	Director Agriculture, U.T., Chandigarh	Ex-officio Member
5.	Director, Rural Development & Panchayats, U.T., Chandigarh.	Ex-officio Member
6.	Conservator of Forest, U.T., Chandigarh (Nodal Officer)	Ex-officio Member
7.	Director Environment or his nominee	Ex-officio Member
8.	Director Science & Technology or his nominee	Ex-officio Member
9.	Deputy Conservator of Forest (HQ), U.T., Chandigarh	Ex-officio Member
10.	Deputy Conservator of Forest, (BG&NR), U.T., Chandigarh	Ex-officio Member
11.	Representative of Finance Department, U.T. Chandigarh	Ex-officio Member
12.	Sh. Parmod Sharma, Yuvsatta, [NGO]	Member
13.	Sh. N K Jhingan, the Environment Society of India [NGO]	Member

The aforesaid Executive Committee shall:-

- (a) Take all steps for giving effect to the State CAMPA and overarching objectives and core principles, in accordance with rules and procedures approved by the Steering Committee and the approved APO.
- (b) Prepare the APO of the State for various activities, submit it to the Steering Committee before end of December for each financial year, and obtain the Steering Committee's concurrence for release of funds, while giving break-up of the proposal activities and estimated costs.
- (c) Supervise the works being implemented in the State out of the funds released from the State CAMPA.
- (d) Be responsible for proper auditing of both receipt and expenditure of funds.

- (e) Develop the code for maintenance of the account at the implementing agency level,
- (f) Submit reports to the Steering Committee for review/consideration; and
- (g) Prepare Annual Report by end-June for each financial year.

The provisions related to composition and functioning of State Level Governing Body and State Level Steering Committee of the State Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA), for Union Territory Chandigarh, will remain the same as notified vide earlier Notification No.FOR/2020/411 dated 23.01.2020.

Dated Chandigarh,
The 04th December, 2025.

MANDIP SINGH BRAR, IAS,
Secretary Forests,
Chandigarh Administration

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**The 28th January, 2025

No. 490713-HII(2)-2024/1493.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **28/2020** dated **10.12.2024** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between:

MEERA SHUKLA W/O SANSAR MANI SHUKLA, R/O HOUSE NO.531,
HALLOMAJRA CHANDIGARH. (Workman)

AND

ESSEN DEINKI PVT. LTD., PLOT NO.22, PHASE – 2, RAMDARBAR, CHANDIGARH-
160002 THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR SHRI AJAY GUPTA AND SHRI NIKHIL JAIN.
(Management)

AWARD

1. Meera Shukla, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that on 24.11.2016 workman joined the management-Company as Package Worker and remained in continuous service up to 18.02.2019. The last drawn monthly wages of the workman were ₹ 5,500/- below the minimum wages notified by the Chandigarh Administration. On 16.02.2019 workman was refused work without assigning any reason and notice. Workman lodged complaint with the Labour Inspector, U.T. Chandigarh for her reinstatement. On amicable settlement, workman rejoined from the management-company and again her service were terminated on 27.07.2019 without compliance of Section 25F of the ID Act. No charge sheet was issued, no inquiry was held and the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation. Management retained some fresh hand in service against the principle of natural justice and in violation to Section 25G of the ID Act and it amounts to unfair labour practice. Refusal of workman amounts to termination under Section 2(o) of the ID Act. Workman has worked for more than 240 days within 12 months preceding termination. Workman raised industrial dispute vide demand notice dated 31.10.2019 under Section 2A of the ID Act. The conciliation proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T Chandigarh failed. Prayer is made that the workman may be reinstated with full back wages along with continuity of service and consequential benefits.

3. On notice, the management contested the claim of the workman by filing written statement on 12.02.2021, wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that there is no termination or retrenchment but it is the workman who was absenting from duty. The workman has not completed 240 days service in the preceding year from the alleged date of termination, thus no industrial dispute.

4. Further on merits, it is stated that workman joined duty on 01.12.2016 and worked up to 15.04.2017. From 15.04.2017 to 02.08.2017 the workman remained absent from duty without any intimation. The workman again joined on 03.08.2017 and worked up to 14.02.2019. From 15.02.2019 to 22.04.2019 workman again absented from duty. The workman again joined on 26.07.2019 and started absenting from duty w.e.f. 27.07.2019. Thus, workman has not completed 240 days of service. The management is covered under the provision of ESIC Act and PF Act and record is maintained during the normal course. The workman was being paid minimum wages as prescribed by the U.T. Administration.

The management never refused the workman to join duty. It is the workman who remained absent from duty on various intervals as explained above. Lastly, the workman joined with the intervention of Labour Inspector on 23.04.2019 and worked up to 26.07.2019 and started remaining absent from duty w.e.f. 27.07.2019. The provision of Section 2(oo) of the ID Act is not attracted. The raising of demand notice dated 31.10.2019 and failure report dated 26.02.2020 is a matter of record. The management is ready to take back the workman on duty. Rest of the averments of claim statement are denied as wrong and prayer is made that claim statement may be answered in favour of the management.

5. The workman filed replication on 22.04.2021, wherein the contents of written statement except admitted facts are denied as wrong and the averments of the statement of claim are reiterated.

6. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 22.04.2021:-

1. Whether the services of the workman were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief she is entitled to, if any ? OPW
2. Relief.

7. In evidence, the workman Meera Shukla examined herself as AW1 and tendered her affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' along with documents Exhibit 'AW1/1' to Exhibit 'AW1/6'.

Exhibit 'AW1/1' is copy of demand notice dated 31.10.2019 served by the workman.

Exhibit 'AW1/2' is the failure report bearing Memo No.943 dated 26.02.2020 of Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh.

Exhibit 'AW1/3' is copy of complaint dated 18.02.2019 filed by the workman to the Labour Inspector, U.T. Chandigarh.

Exhibit 'AW1/4' is the complaint dated Nil filed by the workman to the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Sector 30, Chandigarh.

Exhibit 'AW1/5' is the complaint dated 30.07.2019 filed by the workman to the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Sector 30, Chandigarh.

Exhibit 'AW1/6' is the EPF statement of the workman bearing member ID / Name PBCH000045120000014384/Meera Shukla and establishment ID/Name PBCHD0004512000/ESSEN DEINKI for the period March, 2017 to June, 2019 (as updated on 31.03.2020) accompanied with the details of deposit of employees and employer's share.

8. On 09.05.2024, Learned Representative for the workman closed evidence in affirmative.

9. On the other hand, the management examined MW1 Moti Ram Banga – Personnel Manager of Essen Deinki, who tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with original authority letter issued in his favour by Ajay Gupta – Partner of M/s Essen Deinki vide Exhibit 'M1'.

10. On 18.11.2024 Learned Representative for the management closed oral evidence. On 29.11.2024 Learned Representative for the management tendered in documentary evidence copy of biometric attendance sheet of workman along with wages paid as per the attendance, for the period 01.04.2018 to 30.04.2018, 01.05.2018 to 31.05.2018, 01.06.2018 to 30.06.2018, 01.07.2018 to 31.07.2018, 01.08.2018 to 31.08.2018, 01.09.2018 to 30.09.2018, 01.10.2018 to 31.10.2018, 01.11.2018 to 30.11.2018, 01.12.2018 to 31.12.2018, 01.01.2019 to 31.01.2019, 01.02.2019 to 28.02.2019, 01.04.2019 to 30.04.2019, 01.05.2019 to 31.05.2019, 01.06.2019 to 30.06.2019, 01.07.2019 to 31.07.2019 vide **Exhibit 'MX'** and closed the evidence.

11. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representatives for the parties and perused the judicial file. My issue-wise finding are as below:-

Issue No. 1 :

12. Onus to prove this issue is on the workman.

13. Under this issue the workman Meera Shukla examined herself as AW1 and vide her affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' deposed the averments of claim statement in toto, which are not reproduced here for sake of brevity. AW1 supported her oral version with the documents Exhibit 'AW1/1' to Exhibit 'AW1/6'.

14. On the other hand, the management examined MW1 Moti Ram Banga, who tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' wherein he deposed the entire material contents of the written statement, which are not reproduced here to avoid repetition of discussion.

15. From the oral as well as documentary evidence led by the parties, it comes out that there is no dispute between the parties with regard to the facts that workman joined service with the management on 24.11.2016 and remained in service up to 08.02.2019. It is own case of the workman that she remained on leave from 09.02.2019 up to 15.02.2019. The workman alleged that when she joined office for rejoining service on 16.02.2019, she was verbally refused work. Undisputedly, the workman lodged complaint / Exhibit 'AW1/3' before the Labour Inspector, U.T. Chandigarh wherein parties arrived at settlement and as per settlement the workman again joined on 23.04.2019 and worked up to 26.07.2019.

16. It is argued by the Learned Representative for the workman that the services of the workman were again terminated w.e.f. 27.07.2019 without any notice. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management argued that in fact the workman absented for duty w.e.f. 27.07.2019. Moreover, the workman has not completed continuous period of 240 days in 12 calendar months preceding alleged termination on 27.07.2019.

17. As far as period of 240 days of the service is concerned, it is own case of the management that workman joined duty on 01.12.2016 as Worker and worked up to 15.04.2017. From 16.04.2017 to 02.08.2017, the workman absented from duty without intimation. The workman again joined on 03.08.2017 and worked up to 14.02.2019. Again from 15.02.2019 to 22.04.2019 workman absented from duty. The workman again joined on 23.04.2019 and worked up to 26.07.2019. The workman absented from duty w.e.f. 27.07.2019. For the purpose of Section 25B of the ID Act, the relevant period of 12 calendar months in this case is 26.07.2018 to 26.07.2019. As per the above fact mentioned fact in the written statement and working days of the workman from 26.07.2018 to 14.02.2019 comes to 204 days and from 23.04.2019 to 26.07.2019 comes to 69 days. Thus, total working days comes to 273 days which proves that workman has remained in continuous employment of management for more than 240 days in 12 calendar months preceding termination on 27.07.2019. Thus, workman falls within the definition of 'continuous service' as defined in Section 25B of the ID Act.

18. Now the question is whether the workman absented from duty w.e.f. 27.07.2019 or her services were verbally terminated by the management w.e.f. 27.07.2019. Had the workman absented w.e.f. 27.07.2019 then at the most it amounts to misconduct and the management was bound to initiate disciplinary action against the workman by issuing memo or charge-sheet to the workman against her alleged misconduct and to issue written notice to the workman requesting her to re-join duty. But no such action has been taken by the management. MW1 in his cross-examination stated that no written notice was issued by the management to the workman regarding her alleged absence from duty. MW1 admitted as correct that workman was absent from duty w.e.f. 27.07.2019. The management has not moved any written intimation to any authority of Labour Department alleging that workman is absent from duty. The management has not issued any written notice of absenteeism to the workman. The management has neither appointed any Inquiry Officer nor conducted any domestic inquiry against the alleged absence of workman. On the other hand, the workman has proved on record complaint dated 30.07.2019 / Exhibit 'AW1/5', which show that after refusal of work by the management, the workman immediately approached the Assistant Labour Commissioner, U.T. Chandigarh by filing a complaint against the management alleging that she has been verbally refused duty by the management and then the workman raised the demand notice dated 31.07.2019 / Exhibit 'AW1/1' which supports the workman's plea that her services were terminated by the management w.e.f. 27.07.2019.

19. Before termination of services of the workman w.e.f. 22.07.2019 the management has not complied with the mandate of Section 25F of the ID Act, which lays down certain conditions to be followed by the employer before retrenchment. It would be apposite to reproduce Section 25F of the ID Act, which is as under :-

“25F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen. – No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until–

- (a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;
- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay [for every completed year of continuous service] or any part thereof in excess of six months; and
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government [or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette].”

20. MW1 when put to cross-examination stated that the management has not paid any retrenchment compensation to the workman. It is neither pleaded nor proved by the management that before termination of services of the workman, the workman was issued one month's prior notice or notice pay in lieu of notice period. Thus, the termination of services of the workman w.e.f. 27.07.2019 is in violation to Section 25F of the ID Act.

21. In the written statement, the management has offered that it is ready to rejoin the workman on duty. On the other hand, it has been specifically pleaded by the workman that till date she is unemployed and ready to join the job with the management. It is undeniable fact that workman had been performing the duty of Helper for packing of goods. MW1 in his cross-examination stated that the workman was performing the duty of assembling components. MW1 further stated that the work of assembling components is still going on with the management. MW1 voluntarily stated that the said work has been reduced. There is no suggestion from the workman to deny the above said volunteer statement of MW1. Undisputedly, the last drawn wages of the workman were ₹ 5,500/- per month.

22. Keeping in view length of service i.e. about 2 years 7 months and last drawn wages of the workman, it would be appropriate if the workman is awarded lump sum compensation. Consequently, the workman is held entitled to compensation of ₹ 15,000/-.

23. Accordingly, this issue is decided in favour of the workman and against the management.

Relief :

24. In the view of foregoing finding on the issue above, this industrial dispute is allowed to the effect that the workman is entitled to compensation of ₹ 15,000/-. The management is directed to comply with the Award within three months from the date of publication of the same in Government Gazette failing which the management shall be liable to pay interest at the rate 8% per annum on the above said amount from the date of this Award till it's actual realisation. Appropriate Government be informed. Copy of this Award be also sent to Learned District Judge, Chandigarh in view of Sub-section 10 of Section 11 of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 for onward transmission of the same to concerned Civil Court. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

Dated : 10.12.2024.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory Chandigarh.
UID No. PB0152

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**The 28th January, 2025

No. 490585-HII(2)-2024/1505.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **15/2023** dated **29.11.2024** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between:

AHIBARAN SINGH H.NO.1969, BLOCK 'D' JANTA COLONY, NAYAGOAN,
DISTRICT MOHALI. (Workman)

AND

CHANDIGARH CLUB LIMITED, SECTOR 1, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS
PRESIDENT. (Management)

AWARD

1. Ahibaran Singh, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the claimant-workman (*here-in-after 'workman'*) was employed 27 years back as Machine Operator. The workman remained in the continuous employment up to 15.07.2022 when his services were illegally & wrongly terminated vide letter No.CCL/1637 dated 15th July, 2022. The workman was drawing ₹ 10,852/- per month as wages at the time of termination which was less than the minimum rate of wages. On 15.07.2022, at the close of duty of the workman, the management issued him a letter on the subject abolition of post and consequential retrenchment thereof. In the letter vide which the workman was retrenched, it was alleged that "*in pursuant to the decision taken by the Executive Committee, the post of Machine Operator stand abolished w.e.f. 16th July, 2022. Your (Ahibaran Singh) services are no more required. You will be paid retrenchment compensation and one month's wages in lieu of one month's notice period*". No reason was given as to why the post of Machine Operator is abolished. The workman was not paid retrenchment compensation and other legal benefits at the time of retrenchment. The retrenchment which amounts to termination under Section 2(o) of the ID Act is illegal, wrong, motivated against the principles of natural justice as the post of Machine Operator is still in existence. The management has also violated Section 25F of the ID Act. The claimant was not paid compensation at the time of termination and violation of the same makes the termination void. The services of the workman were terminated by the Secretary of the Club, who is not competent to terminate the services of the workman. In the case of workman, the competent authority is President of the management. Earlier also the workman was suspended on 8th September, 2017. His suspension was revoked on 30.09.2019. As the suspension was revoked the workman was entitled to receive a sum of ₹ 1,45,365/- as wages for the intervening period which was not paid by the management. The workman left with no other alternative but to file a case under Section 33C(2) of the ID Act, which is pending for disposal. For his reinstatement, workman served upon the management a demand notice dated 18.07.2022. The management neither denied the contents of the demand notice nor took the workman back on duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U. T. Chandigarh was requested for his intervention. The dispute could not be settled within the stipulated period. The termination is illegal, wrong, motivated, against the principles of natural justice and unfair labour practice. The workman remained unemployed during the period i.e. from the date of his termination to till date. Prayer is made that the workman may be reinstated with continuity of service along with full back wages with all attendant benefits and without any change in the service condition.

3. On notice, management contested the claim statement by filing written statement on 09.04.2024 wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that claim statement is not maintainable, same is false, frivolous and vexatious. The workman has not approached this Court with clean hands and concealed the material facts. The claim statement is without any cause of action. No legal right of the workman has been infringed so as to file the present claim statement / raise Industrial Dispute. Creation and abolition of posts are purely executive functions. The workman is estopped from filing the present claim statement / raising dispute due to his own act and conduct.

4. Further preliminary submissions are made to the effect that initially the workman was appointed as Labourer on 01.02.2001 and was promoted from time to time. Lastly, workman was holding the post of Machine Operator. However, the said post of Machine Operator was abolished and consequently, letter dated 15.07.2022 was issued vide which the workman was advised to contact the Accounts Department of the Club for finalization of his account and payment of dues as applicable. It was clearly mentioned in the letter that workman will be paid retrenchment compensation and one month's wages in lieu of notice period of one month. The workman instead of approaching the accounts department, served a demand notice dated 18.07.2022 under Section 2A of the ID Act to raise the Industrial Dispute. The entire dues amounting to ₹ 1,90,288/- with one month's wages in lieu of notice period and retrenchment compensation amounting to ₹ 1,29,780/- was ready for payment vide cheque No.051037, 051047 & 011876. The workman deliberately avoided to collect the same from the accounts branch and rather preferred to raise the present Industrial Dispute. Copy of full and final statement retrenchment compensation calculated and cheques are enclosed with the written statement.

5. Further on merits, similar stand is taken as taken in the preliminary submissions. Rest of the averments of claim statement are denied as wrong and prayer is made that the claim statement / reference may be dismissed / declined with costs.

6. Workman filed rejoinder wherein the contents of the written statement except admitted facts are denied as wrong and averments of claim statement are reiterated.

7. From the pleadings of parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 03.05.2024 :-

1. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is illegal ? If so, to what effect and what relief he is entitled to ? OPW
2. Whether the claimant-workman has no cause of action ? OPM
3. Whether the claimant-workman is estopped from filing the present claim statement by his own act and conduct ? OPM
4. Whether the claim statement is not maintainable ? OPM
5. Relief.

8. In evidence, workman Ahibaran Singh examined himself as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' along with copy of letter dated 15.07.2022 regarding abolition of post and consequential retrenchment thereof vide **Exhibit 'W1'**. On 14.08.2024, Learned Representative for the workman closed evidence in affirmative.

9. On the other hand, management examined MW1 Major Singh – Additional Secretary, Chandigarh Club who tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with documents Exhibit 'M1' to Exhibit 'M6'.

Exhibit 'M1' is copy of letter dated 15.07.2022 sent to the workman.

Exhibit 'M2' is copy of full and final account statement of workman.

Exhibit 'M3' is copy of retrenchment compensation benefit detail of workman.

Exhibit 'M4' to Exhibit 'M6' are account payee cheques bearing No.011876 dated 15.07.2022, 051037 dated 15.07.2022 and 051047 dated 15.07.2022 to the workman.

10. On 11.11.2024, Learned Representative for management closed evidence.

11. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representatives for the parties and perused the judicial file. My issue-wise findings are as below :-

Issue No. 1 :

12. Onus to prove this issue is on the workman.

13. Under this issue, workman stepped into witness box as his own witness and vide his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' deposed the averments of claim statement in toto which are not reproduced here for the sake of brevity. AW1 supported his oral version with document Exhibit 'W1'.

14. In order to controvert the claim of the workman, Learned Representative for the management referred the testimony of MW1 Major Singh who vide his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' deposed the entire contents of the written statement including preliminary objections which are not reproduced here in order to avoid repetition. To support the oral version of MW1, Learned Representative for the management referred documents Exhibit 'M1' to Exhibit 'M6'.

15. It is argued by Learned Representative for the workman that workman was employed 27 years back i.e. in the year 1996 (claim statement filed on 06.02.2023) as Machine Operator. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management argued that the workman was appointed as Labourer on 01.02.1991. MW1 in his cross-examination stated that he does not remember exactly that the service of the workman with the management-Club is of 27 years. The period 27 years of service of workman, being not specifically denied by MW1 is deemed to be admitted. Moreover, in the absence of appointment letter and service record which is supposed to be in possession of the management, there is no reason to disbelieve the workman's plea that he was appointed in the year 1996. It is admitted facts of the parties that the workman was appointed as Labourer, then promoted from time to time. It is own plea of the management that lastly the workman was holding the post of Machine Operator.

16. Though in the full & final account statement Exhibit 'M2' the calculation is made on the basic pay of ₹ 12,345/- per month but in the present case, the workman has claimed wages @ ₹ 10,852/- per month.

17. Undisputedly, the services of the workman were retrenched by the management w.e.f. 15.07.2022 on the ground of abolition of post. MW1 in his examination-in-chief / affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' deposed that lastly the workman was holding the post of Machine Operator. However, the said post of Machine Operator was abolished and consequently, letter dated 15.07.2022 / Exhibit 'M1' was issued.

18. For better appreciation, contents of Exhibit 'M1' are reproduced as below:-

"Pursuant to the decision taken by the Executive Committee the post of Machine Operator stands abolished w.e.f. 16th July, 2022. Your services are thus no longer required. You will be paid Retrenchment Compensation and one month wages in lieu of one month's notice period. You may contact the Accounts Section of the Club for finalisation of your account and payment of dues as applicable.

We appreciate your services rendered to the Club and wish you every success in your life and career advancement".

19. MW1 when put to cross-examination stated that in the written statement and his affidavit / Exhibit 'MW1/A', he did not mention the reason for abolishing the post of Machine Operator. It is undeniable fact that management did not issue one month's prior notice before retrenchment of services of the workman vide letter dated 15.07.2022 / Exhibit 'M1'. As per contents of Exhibit 'M1', the management has offered to pay notice pay and retrenchment compensation which would lead to the

inference that no prior notice was given to the workman before retrenchment of his services. The notice pay in lieu of notice period and retrenchment compensation offered to be paid in letter Exhibit 'M1' is vague as no specific amount offered to be paid is mentioned therein. It was also not mentioned as to when and how much amount is to be paid to the workman towards retrenchment compensation. In this regard, MW1 in his cross-examination stated that it was written in the letter dated 15.7.2022 / Exhibit 'W1' as to when and how much amount is to be paid to the workman towards retrenchment compensation. The aforesaid version of MW1 is not acceptable as the contents of Exhibit 'W1' / Exhibit 'M1' are silent about the date when the payment is to be made and the amount which is offered to be paid. MW1 further stated that in Exhibit 'W1', it was mentioned that workman may contact the Accounts Section of the Club for finalization of his account and payment of dues as applicable. MW1 further stated that the due amount as calculated by the management was not offered to be paid to the workman by way of cheque either in the proceedings before Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh or in the proceedings before this Court. From the aforesaid version of MW1 it is made out that from date of retrenchment of services of the workman w.e.f. 16.07.2022 till date the management never made any attempt to pay retrenchment compensation to the workman. The discussion made above would prove that order of retrenchment of the services of the workman vide letter dated 15.07.2022 / Exhibit 'W1' / Exhibit 'M1' whereby the services of the workman were retrenched on account of abolition of post w.e.f. 16.07.2022 is illegal being issued without compliance of the mandatory conditions as laid down under Section 25F of the ID Act.

20. MW1 in his cross-examination recorded on 05.09.2024 stated that today the management is ready to pay the payment to the workman towards notice pay, retrenchment compensation, gratuity, bonus, leave encashment and wages of the intervening period. The management has offered to pay the said amount as calculated in Exhibit 'M2'. To my opinion, the calculation of the benefits calculated in Exhibit 'M2' is incorrect as the same is assessed for the service period of 21 w.e.f. 01.02.2001 instead of 27 years of service of the workman. Accordingly, the workman is entitled to recover ₹ 10,852/- towards notice pay in lieu of notice period and ₹ 1,46,502/- towards retrenchment compensation of the period from the year 1996 to 15.07.2022 (27 years) and ₹ 12,127/- towards leave encashment of 33.5 days @ ₹ 10,862/- per month.

21. As far as bonus and gratuity is concerned, the workman may seek the same from the competent authorities under the Payment of Bonus Act and the Payment of Gratuity Act respectively.

22. Accordingly, this issue is decided in favour of the workman and against the management.

Issues No. 2 To 4 :

23. All these issues are taken up together being inter-connected and in order to avoid repetition of discussion.

24. Onus to prove all these issues is on the management.

25. The workman on retrenchment of his services without any prior notice and without payment of notice pay in lieu of notice period and retrenchment compensation at the time of retrenchment of his services was left with no other option than to raise Industrial Dispute by issuing demand notice. On failure of the conciliation proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, vide failure report bearing Memo No.214 dated 19.01.2023, the workman has presented the Industrial Dispute Reference before this Court with a valid cause of action and locus-standi. No material fact is proved to have been concealed by the workman, therefore, the principle of estoppel is not attracted against the workman. The present claim statement having been filed with a valid cause of action and locus-standi and well within the territorial jurisdiction of the present Court under the relevant provision of ID Act is duly maintainable. I do not find any defect so far maintainability of the present Industrial Dispute Reference / claim statement is concerned.

26. Accordingly, all these issues are decided against the management and in favour of the workman.

Relief :

27. In the view of foregoing finding on the issues above, the industrial dispute is allowed. The workman is held entitled to recover ₹10,852/- towards notice pay in lieu of notice period and ₹ 1,46,502/- towards retrenchment compensation of the period from the year 1996 to 15.07.2022 (27 years) and ₹ 12,127/- towards leave encashment of 33.5 days @ ₹ 10,862/- per month. The management is directed to comply with the Award within three months from the date of publication of the same in Government Gazette failing which the management shall be liable to pay interest at the rate 8% per annum on the abovesaid amount from the date of this Award till its actual realisation. Appropriate Government be informed. Copy of this Award be also sent to Learned District Judge, Chandigarh in view of Sub-section 10 of Section 11 of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 for onward transmission of the same to concerned Civil Court. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

Dated : 29.11.2024.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory Chandigarh.
UID No. PB0152

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**The 28th January, 2025

No. 490739 -HII(2)-2024/1497.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **37/2023** dated **27.11.2024** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between:

VARINDER S/O SHRI UMED SINGH, H.NO. 215-A, HARMILAP COLONY – 2, BALTANA,
DISTRICT MOHALI. (Workman)

AND

1. M/S GILL ENTERPRISES, H.NO.2845, SECTOR 15, PANCHKULA.
2. PRINCIPAL, CHANDIGARH COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY, SECTOR 26, CHANDIGARH. (Management)

AWARD

1. Varinder, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the workman was appointed by the management No.2 on 09.03.2015 as Chowkidar. The workman remained in the uninterrupted employment up to 28.06.2022 when his services were illegally & wrongfully terminated by refusing of work. The workman was drawing ₹ 18,000/- as wages per month. After the appointment by management No. 2, the name of the workman was transferred to one contractor. The name of the workman was again transferred to another contractor and lastly the workman was shown as appointed by management No.1. The contract of employment between management No.1 & 2 was sham contract. The workman was on authorize leave from 15.06.2022 to 28.06.2022 due to sickness. The workman reported for his normal duty on 29.06.2022 but he was refused work by both the managements. Refusal of work which amounts to termination is retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the ID Act. The management has also violated Section 25F of the ID Act. No charge sheet was issued, no inquiry was held and the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation at the time of termination. Violation of the same makes the termination void. Action of the management is illegal, wrong, motivated, against the principle of natural justice and unfair labour practice. The workman remained unemployed from the date of termination to till date. Prayer is made that the workman may be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. On notice, the management No.1 contested the claim of the workman by filing written statement on 08.09.2023, wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that the present reference

is not maintainable against the answering management and is bad in law for mis-joinder of parties. Perusal of statement of claim filed by the workman would show that the workman has impleaded two parties as management-employers including answering management and it is not clear as to from which management the workman is claiming the relief. There cannot be more than one employer of a workman / employee at one point of time. Hence, the present reference being vague & untenable deserves to be dismissed at the thresh-hold without going into the merits of the case. The present statement of claim filed by the workman claiming his alleged termination is not maintainable as the services of the workman have not been terminated by the answering management – M/s Gill Enterprises, as wrongly alleged by him, rather the workman himself abandoned the job of his own volition and never reported back to the answering management after 25.06.2022 in order to be deployed somewhere else.

4. On merits, it is stated that the workman was appointed by the answering management – M/s Gill Enterprises w.e.f 24.02.2022 as Chowkidar on contract basis and was deployed with management No.2 – Principal Chandigarh College of Engineering & Technology, Sector-26, Chandigarh. A contract dated 23rd February, 2022, was entered into between the answering management and management No.2 for providing 22 manpower staff for a specific period of twelve months only starting from 24.02.2022 till 23.02.2023 and accordingly the workman was appointed by the answering management and deployed with the management No.2 w.e.f 24.02.2022 and he worked till 26.06.2022 only. As per the record available with the answering management no application of the workman was received by the answering management for grant of any leave. The workman was paid salary for 26 days he worked in the month of June, 2022 as per the attendance register received from the management No.2. The answering management received a complaint from management No.2 through mail dated 23.06.2022 against the workman that as reported by the In-charge and Joint In-charge Security of management No.2 with supporting pics/video, the workman is not discharging his duty in fair manner and seen asleep and further informed the answering management not to depute the above-named staff with the institution. The answering management, on receiving the mail from the management No.2 informed the workman about the same and further asked the workman to report back to the answering management to be deployed somewhere else. However, the workman never reported back to the answering management, for deployment somewhere else, which amounts to the abandonment of service by the workman himself. The workman was under the employment of the answering management for a period of four months only (i.e. for a period from 24.02.2022 to 26.06.2022) during which he worked with the management No.2. There has been no violation of any of the provisions of ID Act by the answering management. The workman did not complete 240 days, as required to attract the provisions of 25F, hence the question of violation of any of the provisions of the ID Act by the answering management does not arise at all. Remaining averments of the claim statement are denied as wrong and prayer is made that claim of the workman may be dismissed.

5. On notice, the management No.2 contested the claim of the workman by filing written statement on 19.07.2023, wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that the facts submitted by the workman are *supprescio veri* and *exprescio falsi* to the extent that the workman has completely suppressed true and material facts in the present claim statement and has approached the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, U. T. Chandigarh with unclean hands.

6. On merits, it is stated that the workman was neither appointed nor terminated by the management No.2 nor his name was transferred to any contractor by the answering management / office as it is for the outsource agency to re-engage / continue with a particular manpower of earlier service provider for providing services as per contractual obligation. The workman was not on authorised leave as per record available with office of management No.2. The workman performed his duties as per attendance record during the period from 15.06.2022 to 26.02.2022 and afterwards remained absent from 27.06.2022 to 30.06.2022. The concerned service provider was asked through e-mail dated 23.06.2022 for taking appropriate action in the matter as it has been reported by the In-charge Security vide his report dated

20.06.2022 that the workman was found sleeping on duty. There is no relationship between the workman and management No.2. Remaining averments of the claim statement are denied as wrong.

7. The workman filed rejoinder to written statement of management No.1, wherein the contents of written statement, except admitted facts are denied as wrong and the averments of the statement of claim are reiterated. Rejoinder to written statement of management No.2 not filed.

8. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 05.06.2024:-

1. Whether the termination of the services of the workman is illegal ? If so, to what effect and what relief he is entitled to ? OPW
2. Whether the present reference / claim statement is not maintainable ? OPM (management No.1)
3. Whether the claim statement is bad for mis-joinder of parties ? OPM (management No.1)
4. Whether the workman has concealed the material facts and has not approached the Court with clean hands ? OPM (management No.2)
5. Relief.

9. In evidence, the workman Varinder examined himself as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A'. On 21.08.2024, cross-examination of workman / AW1 was conducted by management No.1 and cross-examination on behalf of management No.2 was deferred as there was no representation on its behalf. Workman / AW1 did not appear for his remaining cross-examination despite availing six effective opportunities including last opportunity. No reason was assigned for non-appearance of the workman / AW1. Under the circumstances, the evidence of the workman was closed by order.

10. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management No.1 closed evidence. Learned ADA, Chandigarh Administration for management No.2 tendered into evidence contract dated 23.02.2022 between management No.1 and management No.2 vide Exhibit 'M1' and closed the evidence.

11. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representative for the parties and perused the judicial file. My issue-wise finding are as below:-

Issue No. 1 :

12. Onus to prove issue No.1 is on the workman.

13. Testimony of the workman / AW1 is recorded in part. The workman / AW1 failed to present himself in the witness box for remaining cross-examination. Testimony of AW1 being incomplete cannot be considered. Thus, the workman has failed to discharge the onus.

14. On the other hand, management No.1 did not lead any evidence. Learned ADA, Chandigarh Administration for management No.2 tendered into evidence contract dated 23.02.2022 between management No.1 & 2 vide Exhibit 'M1', which proves that the workman was deployed as an outsource employee by the management No.1 – contractor with the management No.2.

15. In the absence of any evidence on behalf of the workman, the workman has failed to prove the averments pleaded in claim statement.

16. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

Issues No. 2 To 4 :

17. All these issues are taken up together being interconnected and in order to avoid repetition of discussion.

18. Onus to prove issues No.2 & 3 is on management No.1 and onus to prove issue No.4 is on the management No.2.

19. During the course of arguments, these issues were not pressed.

20. Accordingly, issues No.2 & 3 are decided against management No.1 and in favour of the workman. Issue No.4 is decided against management No.2 and in favour of the workman.

Relief :

21. In the view of foregoing finding on the issue No.1 above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)

PRESIDING OFFICER,

Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,

Union Territory Chandigarh.

UID No. PB0152

Dated : 27.11.2024.

Secretary Labour,
Chandigarh Administration.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Ram Kumar Saini S/o Bum Bholi Saini # 185, Hallomajra, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Ram Kumar Sahni.

[192-1]

I, Maha Dev S/o Prem Kumar # 34, Sector 19-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Maha Dev Pandey.

[193-1]

I, Ganesh S/o Ram Lagan Mahto # 1837/A, Small Flats Dhanas, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Ganesh Mahto.

[194-1]

I, Preet Singh S/o Mohinder Singh R/o # 2540, Madi Wala Town, Manimajra, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Parveet Singh.

[195-1]

I, Manju Devi D/o Mehar Singh W/o Dharamvir # 1455/13, Sector 29-B, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Manju.

[196-1]

I, Dev S/o Ramakant Sharma # 568, Near Shiv Mandir, Sector 45-B, Burail, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Dev Sharma.

[197-1]

I, Rajni D/o Ganga Prasad W/o Raman Kumar # 1443, Morigate, Manimajra, Chandigarh, have changed the name of my minor son from Mayank Veer Singh to Manveer Singh.

[198-1]

I, Shiva, Shiva Malik D/o Sunder Singh, R/o H. No. 137, Sector 15-A, Chandigarh, is the same person.

[199-1]

I, Adarsh Malik, Adarsh Kumar, Adarsh Kumar Malik S/o Nanak Chand R/o H. No. 137, Sector 15-A, Chandigarh, is the same person.

[200-1]

I, Arvind Kumar Malhotra S/o Bir Sain Malhotra R/o H. No. 932, Sector 40-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Arvind Malhotra to Arvind Kumar Malhotra.

[201-1]

I, Anita W/o Barinder Singh, R/o # 3097-B, Sector 52, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Ambardeep Kaur.

[202-1]

I, Kumari Pooja W/o Rahul Sharma R/o # 152, New Darshani Bagh Manimajra, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Kumari Pooja to Pooja Sharma.

[203-1]

I, Jagruti Suresh Chaudhari W/o Raj Kishan R/o # 2283-B, SBI Flats, Sector 42-C, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Jagruti.

[204-1]

I, Seema Rani D/o Rajinder Singh, Resident of House No. 2726, Sector 20-C, Near Gurudwara, Chandigarh, (UT), have changed my name from Seema Rani to Simranjeet Kaur.

[205-1]

I, Javed S/o Sh. Parveen kumar R/o House No. 546, Maloya Dairy Complex, Maloya Chandigarh, have changed my name from Javed to Javed Kumar.

[206-1]

I, Krishna Shit W/o Lal Mohan Shit # 522, Mauli Jagran, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Krishna Dhal Shit.

[207-1]

I, Mohamand Hakim S/o Mohammad Yusuf # 1779-C, Small Flats, Dhanas, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Mohammad Hakim.

[208-1]

I, Soma Devi *allias* Pushpa Raizada or Pushpa Rani W/o Mool Raj Raizada # 673, Milk Colony Dhanas, Chandigarh, is one and the same person. Further, I may kindly be known to the name of "Soma Devi" for all future transactions and documents.

[209-1]

I, Mohd Asif Husain S/o Mohd Akram # 3781, Mauli Jagran Complex, Chandigarh, have changed the name of my minor daughter from Alsifa Rani to Alsifa.

[210-1]

I, Ram Bahadur S/o Parsuram R/o H. No. 1-A, Village Khudda Jassu, UT Chandigarh, have changed my minor daughter name from Kumari Rakhi to Rakhi.

[211-1]

मैं, नीतू पत्नी राम बहादुर वासी म. नं. 1-ए, गांव खुड्डा जस्सु यू-टी चंडीगढ़, ने अपना नाम नीतू देवी से बदलकर, नीतू रख लिया है ।

[212-1]

I, Taranjeet Kaur alias Harpreet Kaur W/o Gurdip Singh R/o House No. 82, Sarangpur Chandigarh, have changed my name from Taranjeet Kaur alias Harpreet Kaur to Harpreet Kaur.

[213-1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/ public notices will remain solely, responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc. "